

////

## REMARKS

In the office action mailed April 23, 2003, the examiner: (1) objected to the drawings; (2) objected to informalities in claims 4 and 12; (3) rejected claims 5-7, 9 and 19 as not enabled under Section 112, first paragraph; and (4) rejected claims 1-22 as obvious under Section 103(a) in view of various combinations of prior patents, as discussed below. Each of these items is addressed in turn below.

### 1. Drawings

The examiner objected to the figures as not showing a closed chamber affixed over outward facing lenticules, as recited in original claim 5. As noted below, applicant has amended claim 5 to remove the limitation that the lenticules face outwardly. Applicant also notes that Fig. 5 of the specification shows the closed chamber, and the description thereof describes a preferred use of inwardly facing lenticules. However, the use of outwardly facing lenticules in such a chamber is specifically contemplated on page 8, lines 26-31 of the original specification.

### 2. Informalities in claims 4 and 12

In response to the examiner's objection regarding informalities in claims 4 and 12, the applicant has cancelled claim 4, and the spelling of "fluoropolymer" in claim 12 (and in two other places in the specification) has been corrected.

### 3. Section 112 Rejection

The examiner asserts that the specification fails to teach how a lenticular screen having outwardly facing lenticules could retain optically clear fluid. Fig. 5 of the specification shows the closed chamber, and the description thereof indicates that "the entire outer edge 503 is sealed top keep the liquid from escaping and thereby forms chamber 502." (Specification at ¶27) While it is preferred to use inwardly facing lenticules, see paragraph 25, the use of outwardly facing lenticules in such a chamber is specifically contemplated in paragraph 31. Further, Figures 3 and 4 show the basic configuration for a lenticular screen having outwardly facing and inwardly facing lenticules, respectively. However, these figures do not show the sealed chamber

that is depicted in Fig. 5. Nevertheless, applicant submits that the disclosure is adequate to describe the closed chamber, and the use of either outwardly facing or inwardly facing lenticules therein. Therefore, applicant traverses this ground of rejection and requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection.

4. Section 103(a) Rejections

The examiner rejected claims 1-22 as obvious in view of various combinations the following patents: U.S. Patent No. 6,069,650 to Battersby; U.S. Patent No. 6,046,855 to Goto; and U.S. Patent No. 6,288,846 to Stoner.

Applicant has cancelled claims 1-4 and 22 thereby rendering the rejections thereof moot.

Applicant has amended claim 5 to remove the limitation that the lenticules face outwardly. Thus, claim 5 now covers the case of either inwardly or outwardly facing lenticules. Claim 5 as amended is not taught or suggested by any of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination. The Battersby patent teaches a lenticular screen system wherein the lenticules face outwardly. As the examiner acknowledges, Battersby does not teach inwardly facing lenticules or the use of an antireflective coating. Goto does appear to show inwardly facing lenticules and the use of an antireflective coating. However, neither Battersby or Goto teach or suggest a closed chamber between the lenticular screen and the display screen, and a fluid reservoir in communication with the chamber for introducing and removing an optically clear fluid into the chamber, as recited in claim 5. The apparatus disclosed in Battersby does appear to include a chamber, but not one that is alternately filled and drained with optically clear fluid. Instead, Battersby permanently affixes a liquid crystal material 38 driven by electrodes 34, 37 to change the refractive index to provide switching between a stereo mode and a planar mode. There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Battersby that an optically clear fluid could be introduced into the chamber to deactivate the refractive properties of the lenticular screen and thereby observe images in a planar mode, and then drained from the chamber to activate the refractive properties of the lenticular screen and thereby observe images in a stereo mode.

The Stoner patent appears to teach the use of thin layers of optical liquid between optical surfaces to change refractive properties. However, there is no suggestion or motivation in any of the references to combine such a technique with an autostereoscopic lenticular screen, except

through the hindsight of the present disclosure. For all the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that claim 5 as amended is patentable over any combination of the cited references.

Claims 6 and 7 are dependent from claim 5 and patentable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 8 stands rejected over the cited combination of Battersby and Stoner. However, applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. As noted above, Battersby does not teach or suggest a chamber with optical liquid. Further, although Stoner teaches the use of an optical liquid, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine such a technique with an autostereoscopic lenticular screen, except through the hindsight of the present disclosure. For these reasons, applicant submits that claim 8 is also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 9-17 are dependent from claim 8 and patentable for the same reasons.

Independent claim 18 also stands rejected over the combination of Battersby and Stoner. However, for the same reasons stated above with regard to claim 8, claim 18 is also not taught or suggested by the cited combination. Although Stoner does teach the use of an optical liquid in a closed chamber, there is no suggestion that this configuration would be useful in combination with a lenticular sheet to switch between a planar viewing mode and a stereo mode.

Claims 19-21 are dependent from claim 8 and patentable for the same reasons.

#### CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, applicant submits the claims are now in condition for allowance, and the Examiner's reconsideration of the claims to that end is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned if any additional issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP



By:

Richard A. Nebb  
Reg. No. 33,540

Dated: October 23, 2003

Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1450  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 705-6377 tel  
(415) 705-6383 fax  
[rnebb@dergnoah.com](mailto:rnebb@dergnoah.com)